•

Interview Summary

Application No. 10/002,406 Applicant(s)

Aita et al

Examiner

Sharon Kennedy

Art Unit

3762



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):	
(1) Sharon Kennedy	(3)
(2) Edward Lynch	(4)
Date of Interview Dec 4, 2003	•
Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant	2) applicant's representative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) \(\subseteq \text{Yes} \)	e) 🛛 No. If yes, brief description:
Claim(s) discussed: 1	
Identification of prior art discussed: n/a	
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The word "coextensive" does not appear in the specification. "Coextensive" means "having the same limits, boundaries, or scope" according to The American Heritage Dictionary, 3rd Edition. There is ample support in the disclosure, and it was agreed to add the word at page 5, line 2, after "imageable". In addition, Mr. Lynch wanted to correct the typo in the specification at page 9, line 4.	
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amen allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no available, a summary thereof must be attached.)	dments which the examiner agreed would render the claims copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is
i) 🛛 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa	arate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).
INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MI	MAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST PEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has OM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE ord of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached
•	

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required